



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,291	11/10/2003	George C. Schedivy	8002A-86	5428
22150	7590	05/10/2010	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797				LARSON, JUSTIN MATTHEW
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3782				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
05/10/2010			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@chauiplaw.com
uspto1@chauiplaw.com
garramone@chauiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,291	SCHEDIVY, GEORGE C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Justin M. Larson	3782	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2010.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 20-22,24,25,29-32,34-37,45,46 and 50 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 20-22,24,25,29-32,34-37,45,46 and 50 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 20-22, 24, 25, 29-32, 34-37, 45, 46, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (US 6,380,978 B1) in view of Meritt (US 6,216,927 B1), further in view of Leyden et al. (US 6,371,345 B1), Yoshioka (JP 06197245 A), and Reed (US 6,585,201 B1), and finally in view of Hale (US 5,337,985 A).

Regarding claims 20 and 50, Adams discloses a video system comprising: an entertainment unit (10) comprising: a display (14), a media source (26) coupled to the display; the system being suspended at a rear of a vehicle seat (Figure 2A). Adams also discloses a coupling member (flap shown in Figure 2A that is coupled to the headrest supports) coupled to at least one headrest support member. Finally, Adams discloses a wedge (Figure 2A shows a wedge between the seat and the video system that holds the video system at an angle with respect to the seat) having one end positioned on a rear panel of the system and another end butted directly against the seat, the wedge using friction (friction inherently exists between any two contacting bodies) between the wedge and the seat to prevent the wedge from sliding.

Adams fails to disclose the entertainment unit being temporarily received in a housing, where it is the housing that is suspended from the rear of the vehicle seat. Adams also fails to disclose the coupling member including a bracket and a ring for attachment to the headrest support members; the coupling member being attached to the housing via a moveable ball joint moveable in at least two of x-axis, y-axis, and z-axis directions; and the coupling member being telescopic. Finally, Adams fails to disclose the height of the wedge being less than a height of the housing.

Regarding the housing, Meritt (Figures 9-12) discloses a similar video system (112) suspended at the rear of a vehicle seat and teaches that it was already known for a video system to be temporarily received in a housing (118), where it is the housing that is suspended from the rear of the seat. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a housing like that taught by Meritt with the video system of Adams et al., where the housing would be attached to the vehicle seat and the video system would be removably stored within the housing, the motivation being to allow the video system to be easily removed from the housing and seat for use outside the vehicle.

Regarding the coupling member, Leyden et al. teach that it is desirable to moveably attach (col. 1 lines 20-25) an entertainment device (O) within a vehicle using a rigid coupling member that includes a post (14) having one end attached to a mounting surface in a vehicle and the other end attached to the entertainment device via a moveable ball joint (12/28). Similarly, Yoshioka discloses a device housing (3) suspended from the posts of a vehicle seat headrest via at least one mounting post (2),

where the mounting post is secured about the headrest posts via a bracket that includes a ring (1a/4a), the ring having a circumference (formed by inner surfaces of 1a/4a) that is larger than a circumference of the headrest posts to permit free movement of the ring around the posts. Reed teaches that it was already known for a pivoting entertainment device mounting post (12) to be telescopic. First, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced the flap-type coupling member of Adams with a rigid post-type coupling member, as taught by both Leyden et al. and Yoshioka, the post being attached to the headrest support members with a bracket and ring, as taught by Yoshioka, the motivation being to provide a more rigid and durable connection between the housing and the headrest support members. There is no inventive step in merely choosing between known types of coupling members that couple devices to headrest support members, absent a showing of unexpected results. Second, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made one end of the post of the modified Adams system moveably attached to the housing via a ball joint, as taught by Leyden et al., and to have made the post telescopic, as taught by Reed, the motivation being to allow a greater degree of viewing angle adjustment.

Regarding the height of the wedge, Hale teaches that it was already known for the height of an angle adjusting wedge (10) to be less than a height of the device it is supporting. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have either replaced the wedge of Adams with a wedge like that of Hale, as a mere substitution of known angle adjusting wedges, or to simply make

the height of the Adams wedge less than a height of the housing, as suggested by Hale, as a mere change in size. Examiner notes that it has been held a change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claim 21, the bracket ring (1a/4a) of the modified Adams et al. video system opens and closes (via 5/6 as taught by Yoshioka) to allow placement of the ring around the headrest support member without removing the headrest from the seat.

Regarding claim 22, the bracket of the modified Adams et al. video system includes a locking mechanism (5/6), as taught by Yoshioka.

Regarding claim 24, the mounting post of the modified Adams et al. video system would be capable of being fixed in a plurality of positions along at least one of the x-axis, the y-axis, and the z-axis.

Regarding claim 25, the mounting post implemented on the Adams et al. video system, as taught by Yoshioka, is fixed using a locking nut (6).

Regarding claim 29, materials can either be bendable or unbendable. Therefore, the housing of the modified Adams et al. video system must be one of the two.

Regarding claims 30 and 31, the housing, as taught by Merritt, of the modified Adams et al. video system includes an opening (Figures of Merritt) that provides access to the media source and for allowing a view of the display.

Regarding claims 32 and 50, the housing, as taught by Merritt, of the modified Adams video system is formed in substantially a U-shape having an open side through which the entertainment unit is inserted and removed (Figures of Merritt).

Regarding claim 34, the modified Adams et al. video system is shown to have a power port (Figure 2A, Adams).

Regarding claim 35, the media source of the modified Adams et al. video system is slot-type.

Regarding claim 36, the media source of the modified Adams et al. video system includes a DVD player (10).

Regarding claims 37, 45, and 46, when considering the claimed structure of the mounting mechanism, despite these limitations being functional as currently presented, the modified Adams video system includes all of the claimed features, as set forth above.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/10 with respect to the newly added claim language involving the telescopic coupling member have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, where Reed teaches that such a telescopic coupling member was already known.

4. Applicant arguments filed 2/25/10 with respect to there being no motivation to modify Adams as suggested and to the principle operation of Adams being destroyed have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Regarding the motivation for modifying Adams, the following passages are taken from paragraph 2 above and include underlined motivational statements. With regard to Meritt, "It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a housing like that taught by Meritt with the video

system of Adams et al., where the housing would be attached to the vehicle seat and the video system would be removably stored within the housing, the motivation being to allow the video system to be easily removed from the housing and seat for use outside the vehicle." With regard to Leyden, Yoshioka, and Reed, "First, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced the flap-type coupling member of Adams with a rigid post-type coupling member, as taught by both Leyden et al. and Yoshioka, the post being attached to the headrest support members with a bracket and ring, as taught by Yoshioka, the motivation being to provide a more rigid and durable connection between the housing and the headrest support members. There is no inventive step in merely choosing between known types of coupling members that couple devices to headrest support members, absent a showing of unexpected results. Second, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made one end of the post of the modified Adams system moveably attached to the housing via a ball joint, as taught by Leyden et al., and to have made the post telescopic, as taught by Reed, the motivation being to allow a greater degree of viewing angle adjustment." The motivation for modifying Adams has been clearly set forth.

Regarding the principle operation of Adams being destroyed, Examiner notes that principle operation and intended use of Adams is to "have a portable video player capable of being easily transported and being used under a wide variety of conditions" and to provide "for preservation of the full resolution of an image, while at the same time eliminating motion artifacts" (see col. 1 lines 27-37). The modifications set forth in the

above rejection do nothing to take away from the principle operation and intended use of Adams. Clearly the modifications set forth result in several structural changes to the Adams device as Applicant has contended, but these structural changes in no way harm, change, or take away from the fact that the Adams device is capable of being easily transported and being used under a wide variety of conditions. Examiner notes that Adams does not disclose any criticality to any of the mounting structure shown in Figure 2A and therefore does not teach against modifying the mounting structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize through their own available knowledge and reasoning that various mounting structures and arrangements could be used to secure the Adams device within a vehicle while maintaining the principle operation and intended use set forth by Adams.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date

of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin M. Larson whose telephone number is (571)272-8649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9a-5p (EST). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on (571) 272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justin M Larson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3782
5/5/10